

REMARKS

Claims 39, 41 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by EP 0 884 626 to Takeda et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Takeda et al. reference fails to disclose the claimed method for fabricating a liquid crystal display device that includes the step of “exposing and developing said resist film and forming a resist pattern having a shape on said pixel electrode pattern in which multiple branches extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem,” as defined in independent Claim 39 (emphasis added). One example of an embodiment of the claimed resist pattern with “multiple branches [that] extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem” is represented by resist pattern 34X of Figure 36T. Other examples of the claimed resist pattern, such as pattern 34Y of Figure 37, are shown and described in the present specification. Such branches help orient the liquid crystal molecules of perpendicular orientation in the proper direction.

In contrast to the claimed resist pattern of Claim 39, the resist pattern of the Takeda et al. reference does not have “multiple branches [that] extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem.” More specifically, patterns 20A and 20B of Figure 71 of the Takeda et al. reference are merely a plurality of parallel sets of lines bent to form apexes. Lines 20A and 20B cannot be considered as including the claimed multiple branches that extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem because patterns 20A and 20B lack, *inter alia*, a feature that resembles the claimed “stem.” The apex of either pattern 20A or of pattern 20B cannot be considered as a “stem.” In the entry for “stem” found in Merriam-Webster’s

Collegiate Dictionary (copy of entry enclosed), the most relevant definition is “something held to resemble a plant stem.” The apexes of patterns 20A and 20B cannot reasonably be considered as resembling a plant stem. The correct interpretation of the term “stem” is also reinforced by the context in which this term is used in Claim 39 (“multiple branches [that] extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem”). Additionally, none of the other portions of the Takeda et al. reference disclose the claimed step of forming a resist pattern in which “multiple branches extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem,” as defined in independent Claim 39. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of this §102(b) rejection of independent Claim 39 and associated dependent Claims 41 and 42.

Claims 40-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,959,763 to Bozler et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 40-42 all depend from independent Claim 39, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 39, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of dependent Claims 40-42 under Takeda et al. in view of Bozler et al. be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 39, and also because Bozler et al. does not remedy the deficiencies mentioned above.


Claims 40 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,452,653 to Yamanaka et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 40 and 43 both depend from independent Claim 39, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 39, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of dependent Claims 40 and 43 under Takeda et al. in view of Yamanaka et al. be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 39, and also because Yamanaka et al. does not remedy the deficiencies mentioned above.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

James K. Folker

Registration No. 37,538

September 27, 2005

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\0941\68350\9J7013.DOC



Merriam- Webster's Collegiate® Dictionary

TENTH EDITION

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Merriam-Webster, Incorporated
Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A.



A GENUINE MERRIAM-WEBSTER

The name *Webster* alone is no guarantee of excellence. It is used by a number of publishers and may serve mainly to mislead an unwary buyer.

Merriam-Webster™ is the name you should look for when you consider the purchase of dictionaries or other fine reference books. It carries the reputation of a company that has been publishing since 1831 and is your assurance of quality and authority.

Copyright © 1994 by Merriam-Webster, Incorporated

Philippines Copyright 1994 by Merriam-Webster, Incorporated

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:

Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary. — 10th ed.

p. cm.

ISBN 0-87779-708-0 (unindexed). — ISBN 0-87779-709-9 (indexed).

— ISBN 0-87779-710-2 (deluxe). — ISBN 0-87779-707-2 (laminated cover).

I. English language—Dictionaries.

PE1628.M36 1994

423—dc20

93-32603

CIP

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate® Dictionary, Tenth Edition principal copyright 1993

COLLEGIATE is a registered trademark of Merriam-Webster, Incorporated

All rights reserved. No part of this book covered by the copyrights hereon may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, taping, or information storage and retrieval systems—without written permission of the publisher.

Made in the United States of America

9101112RMcN94

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

